

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-8 remain pending in the application. By the amendment, claims 1 and 8 are amended.

In numbered paragraph 3, on page 2 of the final Office Action, independent claims 1 and 8, along with various dependent claims, are rejected as being unpatentable over WO 00/49769 (Lecheler et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 5,577,252 (Nelson et al.). In numbered paragraph 4, on page 5 of the final Office Action, independent claims 1 and 8, along with all dependent claims, are rejected as being unpatentable over Hewlett-Packard's commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 5,948,055 (Pulsipher et al.) in view of the Nelson et al. patent. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have disclosed at least one collection computer relating to a management domain identifier. As exemplified in Fig. 1, one or more collection stations can be designated as a management domain (e.g., paragraph [0020]). Additional support for the recited management domain identifier and its trust flag may be found in the specification at least at paragraphs [0031]-[0033].

The original intent of the trust flag is to decide if the management station is supposed to perform name resolution on behalf of the collection station. If trust flag is set to no then the management station can decide to perform the name resolution or other operations to resolve the domain of the event. However, Applicants did not intend the trust flag for use as a server link security feature. Rather, Applicants have envisioned that in duplicate IP networks it is possible that two collection stations could send network events with the same names, and under that anomaly,

Applicants have realized that the name can no longer be used or trusted for domain identification. Thus, if the trust name flag is set to, for example, one, then the hostname of the network element as reported from the collection station will be used as the name of the network element, otherwise it will be recomputed at the management station based on, for example, the IP address of the interfaces associated with the network element or node (e.g., paragraph [0030]).

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by claim 1, which recites, among other features, receiving, in at least one management computer, information from the at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag to indicate a binary setting relating to the management domain identifier; and deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve the management domain identifier on behalf of the at least one collection computer based on the binary setting of the trust flag. Claim 8 recites, among other features, at least one management computer for receiving information, from the plurality of collection computers, that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag to indicate a binary setting relating to the management domain identifier, the at least one management computer being capable of deciding whether to resolve the management domain identifier on behalf of the collection computers based on the binary setting of the trust flag.

The Examiner admits at paragraph 3, page 2 of the final Office Action, that "Lecheler did not expressly show (claim 1) a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier"; and admits at paragraph 4, page 5 of the final Office Action, that "Pulsipher does not expressly show (claim 1) a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier." The Lecheler publication and the Pulsipher patent do not teach or

suggest receiving, in at least one management computer, information from the at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag to indicate a binary setting relating to the management domain identifier, as recited in claim 1. Further, the Lecheler publication and the Pulsipher patent do not teach or suggest deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve the management domain identifier on behalf of the at least one collection computer based on the binary setting of the trust flag, as recited in claim 1. Claim 8 claims a system for managing a computer network reciting similar features.

The Nelson et al. patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Lecheler publication and the Pulsipher et al. patent. The Nelson et al. patent discloses an assurance of security provided by a first name server to a second named server (col. 1, lines 54-66). However, the disclosed assurance is respect to the system security between name servers (col. 6, lines 62-66), but not with respect to a management domain identifier, as recited in claim 1. Further, Nelson et al. patent is silent as to receiving a trust flag to indicate a binary setting relating to the management domain identifier. The Nelson et al. patent does not teach or suggest receiving, in at least one management computer, information from the at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag to indicate a binary setting relating to the management domain identifier; and deciding whether the at least one management computer should resolve the management domain identifier on behalf of the at least one collection computer based on the binary setting of the trust flag, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 8.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant's claims 1 and 8 are allowable over the Lecheler et al. publication and the Pulsipher et al. patent, individually or in

combination with the Nelson et al. patent. The remaining claims depend from independent claim 1 and recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. As such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

All rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC



Date: May 5, 2006

By: B. No. 48,360
Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32,858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620